## United States District Court northern district of california San Francisco division

	United States of America,	Case No. CR 17-01933 EMC
	Plaintiff,	) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING ) TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
	David Salvatore Diut, III  Defendant.	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on		
	Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).  The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
	Failure to grant a continuance of counsel, given counsel's other sche exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.	e would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity eduled case commitments, taking into account the S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	Failure to grant a continuance reasonable time necessary for effective diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)	e would unreasonably deny the defendant the ve preparation, taking into account the exercise of due (B)(iv).  SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
	IT IS SO ORDERED.	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CAE
	DATED: 11/27/17	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge
	STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney
	1 thorney for Defendant	Assistant Officer States Attorney